UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/821,961	04/12/2004	Mieko Matsuda	251577US2RD	2367	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER		
			GOODEN JR, BARRY J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3616			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/31/2007	· ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/821,961	MATSUDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Barry J. Gooden Jr.	3616	

	Barry J. Gooden Jr.	3616					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box.1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause				
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	iter form for appeal by materially re	aucing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		maliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)				
		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 3. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
non-allowable claim(s). 7. Solution For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) solution will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>14-18 and 23</u> . Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>19-21</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	It before or on the date of filing a North d sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
16/1/2 8178107							
PAUL N. DICKSON							

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner maintains the previous rejection is proper. Applicant's amendments raise new issues that would require further consideration, as they amend the scope of the claims.